



County of Los Angeles
CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE

713 KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION • LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012
(213) 974-1101
<http://cao.lacounty.gov>

DAVID E. JANSSEN
Chief Administrative Officer

Board of Supervisors
GLORIA MOLINA
First District

YVONNE B. BURKE
Second District

ZEV YAROSLAVSKY
Third District

DON KNABE
Fourth District

MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH
Fifth District

January 9, 2007

To: Supervisor Zev Yaroslavsky, Chairman
Supervisor Gloria Molina
Supervisor Yvonne B. Burke
Supervisor Don Knabe
Supervisor Michael D. Antonovich

From: David E. Janssen
Chief Administrative Officer

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "DJ", is written over the printed name and title of David E. Janssen.

REPORT OF THE INFRASTRUCTURE TASK FORCE

My office convened a meeting of the Infrastructure Task Force on December 18, 2006 pursuant to a December 5, 2006 Board Motion by Supervisors Antonovich and Yaroslavsky. The meeting was attended by representatives of the Departments of Beaches and Harbors, Parks and Recreation, Public Works, and Regional Planning in addition to the Community Development Commission, and the Los Angeles County Office of Education.

Critical Elements of the Strategic Plan

Discussions with Infrastructure Task Force participants emphasized the potential benefits to be gained from a Strategic Plan (Plan) that includes a range of advocacy approaches including outreach to members of the County delegation and key Administration officials and agency heads, coalition building, and alliances with traditional local government partners.

Analysis of Bond Propositions

In furtherance of the Plan, each department, working with its CAO counterpart, is to develop a chart with a narrative identifying the amount of money that is subject to legislative allocation with recommendations for the type of guidelines, criteria, and formulae that will maximize County opportunities for funding.

Various sections in Proposition 1B, for example, the Highway Safety, Traffic Reduction, Air Quality, and Port Security Bond Act of 2006, totaling approximately \$5 billion will be allocated "subject to such conditions and criteria as the legislature may provide by statute." The categories include the Trade Corridor Improvement Fund (\$2 billion), State Air Resources Board, emission reductions related to movement of freight along trade corridors (\$1 billion), State Local Partnership Program (\$1 billion), and Transit System Safety, Security and Disaster Response (\$1 billion).

Similar language appears in Proposition 1C, the Housing and Emergency Shelter Trust Fund Act of 2006. The amount subject to legislative discretion exceeds \$1 billion and consists of \$100 million for an Affordable Housing Innovation Fund, \$850 million for a Regional Planning, Housing and Infill Incentives Account, and \$200 million for a Housing Urban-Suburban and Rural Parks Account.

Finally, Proposition 84, the Safe Drinking Water, Water Quality and Supply, Flood Control, River and Coastal Protection Act of 2006 contains almost \$700 million in various accounts that are subject to legislative purview. There are matching grants to local public agencies for the reduction and prevention of storm water contamination of rivers, lakes, and streams (\$90 million), urban greening (\$90 million), competitive grants for local and regional parks (\$400 million), and planning grants and planning incentives (\$90 million).

Departments also were asked to provide information on how the Legislature has allocated the funds in the past. In some cases, the Legislature merely incorporated guidelines developed by State agencies or departments. At other times, project funding and criteria were based on guidelines that were part of previous bond acts, existing statutory formulas, or distributed on a per capita basis. Finally, departments also were asked if the inclusion of additional criteria would benefit the County and whether the County benefited from the language of prior distributions.

Other parts of these same bond acts are largely outside of legislative purview as is Proposition 1E, the Disaster Preparedness and Flood Prevention Bond Act of 2006. In many cases, funds are allocated according to existing statutes and the Legislature appropriates according to the formulae and criteria contained in these laws. In other cases, the funds are continuously appropriated to a State agency or department for specified purposes. In addition, State departments, such as the Department of Water Resources and Caltrans have been holding stakeholder hearings to discuss appropriate guidelines for bond funds specifically allocated to the agency with the provision that criteria be developed in consultation with affected groups.

Finally, Proposition 1A is not a bond act. It limits the ability of the Legislature and the Governor to divert Proposition 42 transportation funds. Similarly, Proposition 1D, the Kindergarten-University Public Education Facilities Bond Act of 2006, does not contain any allocations to the County nor is it subject to legislative allocation according to the Los Angeles County Office of Education.

County Priority Projects, Cost Estimates, and Timelines for Implementing Projects

Last year, each department went through a process of developing project lists and clearing them with each Board Office. Departments will be meeting with your offices to discuss district priorities and to ensure that the projects are feasible in terms of estimated overall funding requirements and operational funding needs, and are able to overcome any regulatory and financial barriers that would prevent a department from submitting a timely application.

County Advocacy

The goal of the Plan is an equitable allocation of bond funds to ensure that the County receives the maximum amount of funds permitted with the constraints of each bond measure. This will be accomplished through the enactment of legislation which contains equitable allocation criteria or by working with the appropriate State agencies and departments to bring about the same result. It will also include the modification or defeat of bills that do not contain criteria that allow County departments to compete effectively across an array of funding categories.

County advocacy efforts will be tailored to each specific funding opportunity or circumstance. For example, where a Proposition specifically delegates authority for the allocation of bond funds "subject to such conditions and criteria as the legislature may provide by statute", then the County will identify key legislators, committee chairs, and legislative leadership from the County delegation to pursue enactment of guidelines and criteria favorable to the County. Conversely, if primary responsibility for allocation is left to State departments and agencies, advocacy will be geared toward the Administration. In all of these efforts, the County will employ direct advocacy and enlist the support of similarly situated interest groups and stakeholders.

These guidelines and criteria will be developed, discussed, and refined in departmental meetings with Board Offices to put together project priority lists and appropriate legislative language. It is particularly important that these discussions take place as early as possible so that the resources of our Sacramento advocacy office can be employed effectively early in the Legislative Session.

Each Supervisor
January 9, 2007
Page 4

Our Sacramento advocates will then be able to respond to requests from County delegation members for ideas and recommendations for County project funding based on the priority lists and project criteria. They also will gather intelligence from legislative and Administration sources and especially from the leadership of both Houses and will also contact the Governor's Office and arrange meetings for department heads with key legislators and committee chairs and identify appropriate committee meetings where County representatives can provide testimony. Where appropriate, the County will work in partnership with the California State Association of Counties, the Urban Counties Caucus, County Employee Unions, individual counties, and other interests that share the County's objectives. In addition, the County's weekly Legislative Working Group meeting will be used to share intelligence, communicate recent Sacramento developments to the Board, and solicit the Board's assistance in targeted advocacy and discussion of County strategies and tactics.

If you have any questions, please contact Marshall Langberg of my staff at (213) 974-1114, or at mlangberg@cao.lacounty.gov.

DEJ: GK:MAL
MR:EW:LY:hg

c: Each Supervisor
Executive Officer, Board of Supervisors
County Counsel
Beaches and Harbors
Community Development Commission
Los Angeles County Office of Education
Parks and Recreation
Public Works
Regional Planning